## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated March 26, 2009, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected. Claims 1, 7, and 11-12 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch and Ulrich. Claims 2-6 and 9 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, and Bucknell. Claims 13 and 15-17 were rejected under 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, and Ulrich. Claim 8 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich and Friend. Claim 10 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Bucknell, and Friend. Claim 14 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Bucknell. Claim 18 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Friend. And, claims 19-20 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Zirnstein.

Responsive to the rejections of the claims, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combinations of references used against the claims. And, new, independent claim 26 is presented.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to include recitation of a receiver, stated to receive a configuration status summary of the current configuration of a desktop email manager. And, the recitation of the reconfiguration message generator is amended, now to state that the generation of the reconfiguration message is for causing reconfiguration of effectuation of disposition of the email messages responsive to the reconfiguration message. Method claim 13 is analogously amended, now to state, in the recitation of generating, that the reconfiguration message is to request initiation of reconfiguration of disposition of the email messages. And, newly-presented claim 26 includes recitation of a configuration status summary generator and of a home node reconfiguration message processor.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 26, as now-presented, are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations of Lynch and Ulrich and Lynch, Kaplan, and Ulrich. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the claims.

Specifically, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's reliance upon Lynch for showing the configuration status request message generator and the reconfiguration message generator, as now-recited. While the Examiner acknowledged that Lynch fails to disclose a desktop email manager that automatically effectuates a plurality of different disposition for different email messages, the Examiner relied upon Ulrich for disclosing such structure.

In the rejection of the claims, the Examiner relied upon paragraph [0012], [0015], [0079], and [0081]-[0082] for showing a reconfiguration message generator. The Applicant asserts, however, none of the sections of Lynch, nor elsewhere in the reference, is there disclosure of a message whose generation causes reconfiguration of disposition of email messages. Paragraph [0015] merely indicates that an ability to select a desired setting, files, and data that are to be transferred from a first device to a temporary storage device. Even assuming, for purposes of argument, that the file selected to be transferred comprises an email message, paragraph [0015] fails to disclose that the selection is pursuant to a reconfiguration of a desktop email manager by which automatically to effectuate the disposition.

And, while the Examiner relies upon Ulrich for disclosing an email manager, there is no disclosure in Ulrich of such reconfiguration or a reconfiguration message generated pursuant to such goal. Rather, the cited portion of Ulrich appears merely to pertain to synchronization between a mobile device and a desktop computer and to receive certain attachments to electronic mail messages at the mobile device. Claims 13 and 26 are analogously analyzed and are analogously believed to be distinguishable over these references for the same reasons.

8

The Applicant further notes that Kaplan, used in combination with Lynch and Ulrich to reject claim 13, was cited merely for disclosing a mobile node, having a memory device capable of storing a configuration status summary. This reference also fails to disclose the configuration status request message generator and the reconfiguration message generator recited now in the claims.

The remaining dependent claims, which include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims are believed to patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references for the same reason as those just-given with respect to their respective parent claims.

Accordingly, in light of the forgoing, independent claims 1, 13, and 26, and the remaining dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

_____
Robert H. Kelly,
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com